

Rearrangements of Gaussian fields

Raphaël Lachieze-Rey*, Youri Davydov†
USTL, Lille

February 9, 2010

abstract The increasing rearrangement of a univariate function is the increasing function which yields the same image of the Lebesgue measure than the original one. The convex rearrangement of a function is obtained by integrating the monotone rearrangement of its derivative. Both operators can be generalised to higher dimensions, where an increasing function is the gradient of a convex function. We define here the rearrangement of an irregular function as the limit of rearrangements of approximations, and give a consistency theorem.

In this paper, we investigate the asymptotic rearrangements for approximation of random fields. Stronger results are given for Gaussian fields, and the examples of Levy fields and Chentsov fields are derived.

keyword random fields, rearrangement, limit theorems, random measures

MSC 60G60, 60B12, 60G57

Introduction and notation

The following notation will be useful. In $\mathbb{R}^d$, denote by $\mathbf{e} = (\mathbf{e}^i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ the canonical basis, and $+$ stands for the Minkowski addition of sets. The operators vol , diam , cl , int , ∂ resp. stand for the volume, diameter, closure, interior and border of a Borel set. For a centred random vector Y taking values in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\text{cov}(Y)$ is its covariance matrix, with $\text{cov}(Y)_{ij} = \mathbb{E}(Y_i Y_j)$, $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. Given two real random variables X_1, X_2 , also write $\text{cov}(X_1, X_2) = \mathbb{E}(X_1 X_2) - \mathbb{E}(X_1)\mathbb{E}(X_2)$ their covariance. The weak convergence of measures is denoted by $\Rightarrow$.

Preliminary example Consider a finite population, arbitrary labelled with numbers k in $\{1, \dots, N\}$, for $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$. For $1 \leq k \leq N$, the member k receives an income of a certain resource, denoted by a real number $g(k)$. Now call σ

*raphael.lachieze-rey@math.univ-lille1.fr

†youri.davydov@math.univ-lille1.fr

the permutation of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ which makes the function $k \rightarrow g(\sigma(k))$ increasing. Call $\tilde{g} = g \circ \sigma$ the *monotone rearrangement* of g .

Define $C(k) = \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{g}(i)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$. Since $\tilde{g}$ is monotone, C is convex. For $1 \leq k \leq N$, $C(k)$ represents the total amount of resources detained by the $\frac{k}{n}$ -th poorest fraction of the population. Now, call $\bar{C}(k) = \frac{k}{n}C(n)$. It is the “equality function”, in the sense that $C = \bar{C}$ iff all incomes are equals. Also, for some distance δ , the distance $\mathcal{I}_\delta = \delta(C, \bar{C})$ between C and its equality function measures the inequalities among the population.

If one defines $f(k) = \sum_{i=1}^k g(i)$, $1 \leq k \leq N$, the cumulated income, C is called the *convex rearrangement* of f . It is indeed the only convex functions which has the same increments (but in an other order), and coincides with f in 1 and N . Consider for instance the case where δ is the L^1 norm on $\mathbb{R}^N$. For a given cumulate income function f , the quantity

$$\mathcal{I}_\delta = \sum_{k=1}^N (C(k) - \frac{k}{n}f(n))$$

retrieves the Gini coefficient, which has played a central role in measuring economic inequality since its introduction by Corrado Gini at the beginning of the 20th century. The use of the convex rearrangement for measuring economic inequality is discussed in [12].

The notion of rearrangement, defined above for a discrete population, can be generalised in the continuous framework. If g_1 is an integrable function on $[0, 1]$, and σ is a transformation of $[0, 1]$ which preserves Lebesgue measure, the function defined by

$$g_2 = g_1 \circ \sigma \tag{1}$$

is a rearrangement of g . Roughly, the function g_2 takes each value the same number of times than g_1 does, but not at the same places. For any function g , denote by μ_g the image of Lebesgue measure under g . Relation (1) also implies

$$\mu_{g_2} = \mu_{g_1}. \tag{2}$$

A function g_2 is said to be a rearrangement of g_1 if it satisfies (2), but this is not equivalent to (1). Consider for instance $g_1(x) = x$ and $g_2(x) = (2x - [2x])$ on $[0, 1]$. They are rearrangements of one another but it is not possible to find σ such that (1) is satisfied.

The situation on a compact body K of $\mathbb{R}^d$ is similar. For a function g integrable on K , call μ_g the image of Lebesgue measure λ_d under g . Then a function g_2 is a rearrangement of an other function g_1 iff it satisfies (2). The rearrangement is furthermore said to be monotone if g_2 is a monotone function, i.e the gradient of a convex function. According to Brenier’s theorem, stated in section 1, each integrable function admits a unique monotone rearrangement. The result includes a non-degeneracy conditions on μ_g for having (1) as well.

In this article, we define the convex rearrangement of a multivariate smooth function f as the function obtained in rearranging the gradient of f monotonically. It generalises the notion of convex rearrangement on $\{1, \dots, N\}$ introduced in the preliminary example.

If a function is irregular, one can take regularisations and study asymptotically their rearrangements, under the proper renormalisation. One of our main results states that the asymptotic rearrangement is consistent, i.e if μ_{g_n} admits a weak limit, for a sequence of functions $\{g_n; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then the monotone rearrangements of the g_n also converge. The result is similar concerning convex rearrangements. With this tool, asymptotic convex rearrangement of some random fields are studied, with stronger results for Gaussian fields. A section is devoted to the study of examples, like the Lévy and Chentsov field. It will become apparent in this paper that asymptotic rearrangement is a complex transformation for multivariate fields. In particular, the results are highly dependant on the method of approximation.

It is of practical and theoretical interest to investigate asymptotic properties of rearrangements. It can be used, for example, to construct estimators of parameters of stochastic processes, and for measuring their fluctuations, see [7]. There are also connections between convex rearrangement and other areas of research such as Finance Mathematics and Economics. The Lorenz curve, important in finance mathematics, is a common object in convex rearrangement of Gaussian processes. In the field of econometrics, convex rearrangement can be used to measure the indices of fluctuations of stochastic processes, related to indices of economic inequality, like the Gini index in the preliminary example, see [12]. The monotone rearrangement of a function g also has a physical meaning, as the solution of the optimal transport problem with transfer plan g .

The first section is devoted to explain the principles of rearrangement in one dimension. The example of Brownian motion is developed as explanatory example. A survey of the results concerning rearrangements of stochastic processes of one variable can be found in [7]. Then, a reduced version of the problem of optimal transport is introduced, and we give its connection with monotone rearrangement. An adapted version of Brenier's theorem is given, which yields a rigorous definition of monotone and convex rearrangements. A necessary and sufficient condition for the convergence of the rearrangements of a sequence of functions is the main result of this section.

In Section 2, given a family of random fields $\{Y_n; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, typically irregular, we investigate conditions that ensure the existence of the limit of their rearrangements. We obtain stronger results in the case of Gaussian fields approximated by polygonal interpolations. The efficiency of the method is illustrated in Section 3, where various types of examples are derived using the convergence results.

1 Monotone rearrangements and optimal transport

This section exposes the theoretical material required for rearranging multivariate functions with compact support. It is related to the optimal transport problem, in that the monotone rearrangement $\mathfrak{M}T$ of a transport plan T coincides with the optimal solution to the corresponding transport problem. Then, we study the consistency of the monotone rearrangement, needed for rearranging irregular functions, the same way it is done for Brownian motion just below.

1.1 One dimensional case. Convex rearrangement of the Brownian motion

The monotone rearrangement of an integrable function g on $[0, 1]$ has been defined in the introduction. It is the unique increasing function with the same distribution, and is denoted by $\mathfrak{M}g$. It has been shown in [9] that every integrable function on $[0, 1]$ admits a monotone rearrangement, unique up to a negligible set. We emphasise here that the central object of the monotone rearrangement is μ_g , the image of Lebesgue measure under g . In other words, two functions have the same rearrangement if they have the same distributions.

If now f is an absolutely continuous function on $[0, 1]$, i.e such that for all x in $[0, 1]$, $f(x) - f(0) = \int_0^x g(t)dt$ for some integrable function g , the *convex rearrangement* of f is the unique convex function $\mathbf{C}$ verifying $\mathbf{C}(0) = f(0)$ and $\mathbf{C}' = \mathfrak{M}f'$ a.e. Write $\mathbf{C} = \mathfrak{C}f$, where $\mathfrak{C}$ is the *convex rearrangement operator*.

For f irregular, one chooses smooth approximations $\{f_n ; n \geq 1\}$, and studies the asymptotic of the rearrangements. If there exists a sequence $\{b_n ; n \geq 1\}$ and a convex function $\mathbf{C}$ such that $\frac{1}{b_n}\mathfrak{C}f_n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ a.e, $\mathbf{C}$ is said to be an *asymptotic convex rearrangement* of f with *renormalising sequence* $\{b_n ; n \geq 1\}$.

There is a wide literature investigating the asymptotic convex rearrangements of random processes. Although a rigorous study is not trivial, it is possible to understand better the convex rearrangement machinery in the case of the Wiener process. Take X a standard Brownian motion on $[0, 1]$, with X_n its piece-wise linear interpolation on $\{\frac{k}{n} ; 0 \leq k \leq n\}$, normalised by $\sqrt{n}$ to avoid the divergence of its derivative. For each n , X_n is differentiable a.e., and the image of Lebesgue measure λ_1 under the renormalised derivative is written $\mu_n = \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} X'_n \right)^{-1}$. The independence of increments implies that μ_n is the empirical measure of n independent normal variables, and it is clear that it will converge weakly to the normal distribution γ_1 . It will be rigorously proven later, in theorem 1.2 why this implies that the asymptotic convex rearrangement of X on $]0, 1[$ is the Lorenz curve GL_1 , defined as the unique convex function with gradient distribution γ_1 . Davydov and Vershik [6] obtained the strongest result, namely the uniform convergence of $\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathfrak{C}X_n - GL_1\|_\infty$ to 0 with probability 1.

A lot of similar results are obtained with processes that have stationary increments, or are stable, see the survey [7]. Azais and Wschebor [1] also showed that, for X in a certain class of Gaussian processes, if instead of a piece-wise linear approximation, one chooses for X_n a regularisation of X by a convolution kernel, then X admits the same asymptotic convex rearrangement, namely the generalised Lorenz curve GL_1 . In this case, the asymptotic convex rearrangement of f seems unambiguous, modulo the multiplication by a non-zero constant, in the sense that it does not depend on the approximation method. We will see in section 3 that it is not the case for most multivariate random fields.

1.2 The optimal transport problem and rearrangement operators

The problem described below is a simplified version of the traditional optimal transport problem, which is fully described and exhaustively discussed in [11].

A company has a capacity of production per unit time represented by a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^d$, the *production measure*. The quantity produced in area dx per unit time is $\mu(dx)$. This company has to deliver its products to a domain K of $\mathbb{R}^d$, compact and convex, where the demand is uniformly distributed. The cost of transport between a site of production s and a point z in K is proportional to $\|s - z\|$, the Euclidean distance. A transport plan S is a function which associates to each z in K the corresponding production site $S(z)$, where the product delivered to z comes from. In particular, we need to have, for all Borel set $B \in \mathcal{B}_d$,

$$\mu_S(B) = \mu(B), \quad (3)$$

so that all production sites provide the required quantity of product. The total cost of this transport plan (per unit time) is hence

$$C(S) = \int_{z \in K} \|z - S(z)\| dz.$$

The optimal transport problem consists in finding a transport plan $S : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ minimising the cost $C(S)$ under requirement (3). Addressing this issue, suppose that a given transport plan S is modified by switching the destinations z and ζ for two productions sites $S(z)$ and $S(\zeta)$ for an infinitesimal quantity of product. The new transport plan is denoted $\tilde{S}$ and the corresponding cost variation is

$$C(\tilde{S}) - C(S) = 2\langle z - \zeta, S(z) - S(\zeta) \rangle (dz + d\zeta).$$

Informally, a transport plan will be in some sense locally optimal if, for all $z, \zeta \in K$,

$$\langle z - \zeta, S(z) - S(\zeta) \rangle \geq 0. \quad (4)$$

It turns out that (4) and (3) indeed characterise optimal transport plans (see [11]).

The question that naturally arises now is about the existence of such an optimal transport plan. That is the purpose of the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1 (Brenier).

Call $\mathcal{K}(K)$ the class of convex functions on K . Let $\mathcal{G}(K)$ be the set of monotone functions on K , defined by

$$\mathcal{G}(K) = \left\{ \nabla \mathbf{C} \mid \mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}(K), \int_K \|\nabla \mathbf{C}\| < \infty \right\}.$$

Then, if μ is a measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with finite first moment, there is a unique monotone function in $\mathcal{G}(K)$, denoted by $\mathbf{M}_\mu$, such that $\lambda^d \mathbf{M}_\mu^{-1} = \mu$. If a point z_0 of K is unambiguously defined as “starting point”, call $\mathbf{C}_\mu$ the convex function which gradient is $\mathbf{M}_\mu$, satisfying $\mathbf{C}_\mu(z_0) = 0$.

Comments, proof, and a more general result can be found in [3]. The function $\mathbf{M}_\mu$ is the optimal solution of the transport problem with production measure μ .

Theorem 1.1 is the proper tool to define high dimensional monotone and convex rearrangements.

Definition 1.1. For an integrable function g on K , define $\mathfrak{M}g = \mathbf{M}_{\mu_g}$ its monotone rearrangement.

For a function f which gradient is integrable, there exists a unique convex function, denoted $\mathfrak{C}f$, which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^d (\nabla \mathfrak{C}f)^{-1} &= \lambda^d (\nabla f)^{-1}, \\ \mathfrak{C}f(z_0) &= f(z_0). \end{aligned}$$

It is called convex rearrangement of f .

The convex rearrangement can also be defined as $\mathfrak{C}f = \mathbf{C}_{\mu_{\nabla f}} + f(z_0)$. Given a vector-valued function S on K , since $\mathfrak{M}S$ is the gradient of a convex function, its restriction to each segment $[z, \zeta] \subset K$ is increasing, and hence it satisfies (4). In this regard, theorem 1.1 provides with $\mathfrak{M}S$ a unique solution to the optimal transport problem with transport plan S . Note that [3] also gives the existence of a measure-preserving transformation σ of $[0, 1]$ such that $\mathfrak{M}S \circ \sigma = S$, provided μ_S is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, which justifies the “rearrangement” terminology.

In dimension 1, convex rearrangement was already defined in the literature. The class $\mathcal{S}(K)$ is exactly that of absolutely continuous functions if K is a compact interval of $\mathbb{R}$. Hence, it is a generalisation of absolutely continuous functions upon which we extend operator $\mathfrak{C}$. Note that, although it is called “convex rearrangement”, function $\mathfrak{C}f$ is not a rearrangement of f in the sense of (2). For instance, f and $\mathfrak{C}f$ do not in general yield the same maximum.

Nevertheless, visually it corresponds in some way to piling up the increments of f in another order.

Here is a simple example that allows us to rearrange multivariate fields with a simple structure.

Proposition 1.1. *Let $A_1, \dots, A_d$ be compact intervals of $\mathbb{R}$ and for each i in $\{1, \dots, d\}$, let f_i be a function in $\mathcal{S}(A_i)$. Then, the function $f = \bigoplus_{i=1}^d f_i$, defined on $K = A_1 \times \dots \times A_d$ by*

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^d f_i(z) = f_1(z_1) + f_2(z_2) + \dots + f_d(z_d)$$

satisfies

$$f \in \mathcal{S}(K),$$

$$\mathfrak{C}f = \bigoplus_{i=1}^d \mathfrak{C}f_i.$$

Concerning the starting point z_0 , it is arbitrary and plays no role. It will sometimes be implicitly defined and not mentioned, but one has to be consistent with its use. For instance, in the previous example, operator $\mathfrak{C}$ is defined on subsets A_i of $\mathbb{R}$, with implicit starting points $z_{0,i}$. In order for the assertion to be true, one has to take on K as starting point of convex rearrangement $z_0 = (z_{0,i})_{1 \leq i \leq d}$.

Proof or proposition 1.1. Denote by $\bigotimes$ the product of measures. One simply has to use the fact that

$$\mu_{\nabla f} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^d \mu_{f'_i} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^d \mu_{\mathfrak{M}f'_i} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^d \mu_{(\mathfrak{C}f_i)'},$$

since the $\mathfrak{M} f'_i$ are rearrangements of the $f'_i, i = 1, \dots, d$. We also have,

$$\mu_{\nabla(\bigoplus_{i=1}^d \mathfrak{C}f_i)} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^d \mu_{(\mathfrak{C}f_i)'} = \mu_{\nabla f},$$

and this means that $\bigoplus_{i=1}^d \mathfrak{C}f_i$ is a convex function having the same gradient distribution as ∇f . It yields the result because these functions coincide in z_0 . $\square$

1.3 Consistency of the rearrangement operators

In this article we deal with irregular random fields, for which we cannot a priori obtain a convex rearrangement due to the absence of gradient. In consequence, by analogy with the 1-dimensional case, we instead investigate asymptotically the convex rearrangement of their regularisations. Call *asymptotic monotone*

rearrangement of g any monotone function that is the limit of renormalised monotone rearrangement of smooth approximations of g . The theorem 1.2 will allow us to obtain an asymptotic monotone rearrangement of a function studying the asymptotic of its gradient distributions.

Similarly, for a function f , call *asymptotic convex rearrangement* of f the limit of convex rearrangements, after renormalisation, of approximations of f . It will become apparent along this article that, if one simply uses this definition, the set of all possible asymptotic monotone rearrangement of a given function is wide. To have consistency between convex rearrangement and asymptotic convex rearrangement for a smooth function, one need at least to control the gradient of the approximation.

Denote by $u_n \xrightarrow{K} u$ the point-wise convergence on the interior of K . If K is implicit, it will be omitted. In the sequel, K is a convex body of $\mathbb{R}^d$, with an arbitrary starting point $z_0 \in K$. The following theorem will be our main tool for rearranging random fields.

Theorem 1.2.

Take $\{f_n; n \geq 1\}$ and f in $\mathcal{S}(K)$, and define $g_n = \nabla f_n$, $g = \nabla f$. Then the three following statements are equivalent:

$$\mu_{g_n} \Rightarrow \mu_g, \quad (5)$$

$$\mathfrak{M}g_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}g, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathfrak{C}f_n - f_n(z_0) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}f - f(z_0). \quad (7)$$

The proof is in section 5.1.

Remark 1.1. The convergence here only occurs on $\text{int}(K)$. In order to obtain uniform convergence on all K , one has to control that the gradient is never “too large” on “small sets”, typically located on the edges of K . Formally, we have the following sufficient condition, proved in [8]. With the previous notation, note the gradient’s norm distribution function by $F_n(a) = \lambda_d(\{z; \|\nabla f_n(z)\| \geq a\})$, $a \geq 0$. If

$$(F_n)^{1/d} \text{ is uniformly integrable in } +\infty, \quad (8)$$

then $(\mathfrak{C}f_n)$ is equicontinuous on K , and the convergence is uniform on K . Due to the light tail of Gaussian distributions, it is likely that the Gaussian fields under study will satisfy (8) after approximation and renormalisation, but it is not the purpose of this article to obtain optimal results, and we only checked condition (5) in our examples.

A similar result was already proved in the 1-dimensional case in [4], including the corresponding condition for uniform convergence on all K , not only its interior. In the probabilistic framework, in order to check condition (5) for random fields, it is easier to deal with characteristic functions. We use the following lemma:

Lemma 1.1. *Let $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random probability measures with characteristic functions $(\varphi_n)_{n \geq 1}$. If there is a probability measure μ with characteristic function φ such that, for all h in $\mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\varphi_n(h) \rightarrow \varphi(h) \text{ a.s.,}$$

then $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$ with probability one.

Proof. We have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi_n(h, \omega) \rightarrow \varphi(h, \omega)\}} dh \mathbb{P}(d\omega) = 1.$$

Due to Fubini's theorem, with probability one, for almost all h of $\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\varphi_n(h) \rightarrow \varphi(h),$$

and it is well known that it implies the weak convergence of the corresponding probability measures. $\square$

The next result can also be used. Following [2], call convergence-determining class $\mathcal{C}$ a class of Borel sets such that the weak convergence of measures follows from the point-wise convergence on $\mathcal{C}$. Theorem 2.2 p.15 in [2] implies that there is a countable such class in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and hence in our case it is enough to show $\mu_n(B) \rightarrow \mu(B)$ a.s, for all μ -continuous Borel set B in the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}_d$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

2 Asymptotic rearrangement of random fields

In this section, we consider a random field X defined on K_d and give general results about its asymptotic rearrangement. Then we give the main theorem of convergence in the case of Gaussian fields, in the framework of polygonal approximation. This generalises the asymptotic convex rearrangement of the Brownian motion derived in Section 1.1.

2.1 General results

The notation $\{Y_n ; n \geq 1\}$ stands here for a sequence of smooth vector valued random functions, and $\{\mu_n = \mu_{Y_n} ; n \geq 1\}$ are their distributions. In this section general results concerning the asymptotic of $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$ are given. The objective is to obtain a deterministic limit measure μ of the μ_n , and use the consistency theorem 1.2 We first derive an expression of the only possible limit μ with the help of Fubini's theorem: Given a measurable set B of $\mathcal{B}_d$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\mu_n(B)) = \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{K_d} \mathbf{1}_{Y_n(z) \in B} dz \right) = \int_{K_d} \mathbb{P}(Y_n(z) \in B) dz. \quad (9)$$

Letting n go to ∞ in (9) yields the following:

Proposition 2.1. *We assume that the two following conditions hold:*

There exists μ probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that, a.s, $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$, (10)

For a.e. z in K_d ,

there exists μ_z probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mu_{Y_n(z)} \Rightarrow \mu_z$. (11)

Then,

$$\mu(B) = \int_{K_d} \mu_z(B) dz, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}_d. \quad (12)$$

We also have $\mathfrak{M}Y_n \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_\mu$ in virtue of theorem 1.2.

Now, as a first example, the following proposition gives a sufficient condition on the conjoint laws of the variables $(Y_n(z))_{z \in K_d}$ for the convergence of μ_n .

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that (11) is satisfied. Define μ by (12). Let $Y_{\sigma(n)}$ be a sub-sequence such that, for all μ -continuity sets B in a convergence-determining class of $\mathcal{B}_d$ (see. [2], p.15),*

$$\int_{(K_d)^2} \sum_{n \geq 1} \text{cov} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{Y_{\sigma(n)}(z) \in B\}}, \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_{\sigma(n)}(\zeta) \in B\}} \right) dz d\zeta < \infty, \quad (13)$$

then $\mu_{\sigma(n)} \Rightarrow \mu$ a.s.

We hence have asymptotic convex rearrangement with probability 1 for some sub-sequences.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\sigma(n) = n$. For B a μ -continuity Borel set in the convergence determining class,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} (|\mu_n(B) - \mathbb{E}(\mu_n(B))|^2) = \mathbb{E} (\mu_n(B)^2) - (\mathbb{E} \mu_n(B))^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{K_d} dz \mathbf{1}_{Y_n(z) \in B} \int_{K_d} d\zeta \mathbf{1}_{Y_n(\zeta) \in B} \right) - \int_{K_d} dz \mathbb{P}(Y_n(z) \in B) \int_{K_d} d\zeta \mathbb{P}(Y_n(\zeta) \in B) \\ &= \int_{K_d} dz d\zeta [\mathbb{E} (\mathbf{1}_{Y_n(z) \in B} \mathbf{1}_{Y_n(\zeta) \in B}) - \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{Y_n(z) \in B}) \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{Y_n(\zeta) \in B})] \\ &= \int_{K_d} dz d\zeta \text{cov} (\mathbf{1}_{Y_n(z) \in B}, \mathbf{1}_{Y_n(\zeta) \in B}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, hypothesis (13), along with Borel-Cantelli's lemma ensures that for all B in $\mathcal{B}_d$, with probability one, $\mu_{\sigma(n)}(B) \rightarrow \mu(B)$. This relation is hence true a.s simultaneously for all Borel sets of a countable generating subclass of $\mathcal{B}_d$, and so $\mu_{\sigma(n)} \Rightarrow \mu$ with probability 1 (See theorem 2.2 in [2]). Theorem 1.2 completes the proof. $\square$

For most of the random fields investigated in Section 3, $\text{cov} (\mathbf{1}_{Y_n(z) \in B}, \mathbf{1}_{Y_n(\zeta) \in B})$ is in $O(\frac{1}{n})$ and we cannot have asymptotic rearrangement for $\mathfrak{M}Y_n$. We need stronger results in this case, and were able to obtain them in the framework of Gaussian fields, interpolated on a simplicial triangulation.

2.2 Simplicial approximations on K_d

Most of the commonly investigated random fields of the literature are irregular, and hence cannot be directly rearranged, they need to be approximated by smooth functions. In this article, we only followed the following paradigm: Given a random real field X , define approximations X_n of X , then normalise and rearrange monotonically their gradient, which will be called $Y_n = \frac{1}{b_n} \nabla X_n$.

In this paradigm, one would like the result not to depend on the choice of the approximation X_n , as long as it converges to X . It is in the very nature of the convex rearrangement to be sensitive to slight changes in the approximation method. Consider for instance the following deterministic example. Define f_n as the continuous function on $[0, 1]$ null in 0, linear on each segment $[\frac{k}{n}, \frac{k+1}{n}]$ for $1 \leq k < n$, and with slope ± 1 . Then, f_n uniformly converges to the (convex) null function, but $\mathfrak{C}f_n$ uniformly converges to the convex piece-wise linear function null in 0 having slope -1 on $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $+1$ on $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. To avoid this kind of phenomenon for asymptotic convex rearrangement, one needs to control that the gradient of the approximation resembles the gradient of the original function, or its variations if there is no gradient. That is one of the reasons why we chose for X_n the interpolations of X on a reasonable subset, namely the vertices of a triangulation. We present now the definitions and notations needed for stating the results.

Denote by K_d the unit cube $[0, 1]^d$. Call simplex of $\mathbb{R}^d$ the convex hull of any $(d + 1)$ -tuple of points with non-empty interior, and call triangulation of K_d any finite simplicial partition of K_d . Let $\mathcal{T}$ be such a triangulation of K_d . Denote by $X^\mathcal{T}$ the simplicial approximation of X with respect to $\mathcal{T}$, i.e. the function which is affine above each T in $\mathcal{T}$ and coincides with X above the vertices of $\mathcal{T}$. If $(\mathcal{T}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is a sequence of triangulations such that $\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_n) = \sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_n} \text{diam}(T) \rightarrow 0$, it is called an approximating triangulation. In this case denote by $X_n^\mathcal{T}$ the corresponding approximation, i.e $X_n^\mathcal{T} = X^{\mathcal{T}_n}$. We will consider in this paper exclusively approximating triangulations of a special form, described below.

Call *germ of triangulation* any finite set of simplexes $\mathcal{T}$ verifying the following property: There exists a network Γ of $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\{\gamma + T \mid \gamma \in \Gamma, T \in \mathcal{T}\} \text{ is a partition of } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (14)$$

Any network Γ satisfying (14) is said *admissible* for $\mathcal{T}$, and the notation $\Gamma_\mathcal{T}$ refers to an arbitrary choice of such a network. Then define, for $n \geq 1$,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n = \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}, \gamma \in \Gamma_\mathcal{T}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n}(\gamma + T) \cap K_d \right\}.$$

Property (14) ensures that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$ is indeed a partition of K_d . The problem is that the set $\frac{1}{n}(\gamma + T) \cap K_d$ might not be a simplex. However, those problematic $\frac{1}{n}(\gamma + T)$ won't play any role in the asymptotic convex rearrangement because their number is negligible. So, arbitrarily divide each of them in a simplicial

partition such that there is, for all n , a triangulation $\mathcal{T}_n$ which is a simplicial sub-partition of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$, and differs from $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$ only regarding the simplexes touching the border of K_d . Identify $\mathcal{T}$ with the simplicial approximating triangulation sequence $(\mathcal{T}_n)_{n \geq 1}$.

Since $X_n^\mathcal{T}$ is a.e affine, denote by $\nabla X_n^\mathcal{T}$ its gradient. In all the paper, $\{b_n; n \geq 1\}_{n \geq 1}$ stands for a sequence of positive numbers which aims to give sense to $\lim_n \frac{1}{b_n} \mathfrak{M} \nabla X_n^\mathcal{T}$ (or, equivalently- see theorem 1.2)- to $\lim_n \frac{1}{b_n} \mathfrak{C} X_n^\mathcal{T}$. The renormalised gradient is denoted by

$$Y_n^\mathcal{T} = \frac{1}{b_n} \nabla X_n^\mathcal{T}.$$

Using theorem 1.2, to obtain the rearrangement of $Y_n^\mathcal{T}$, it is more convenient to work with its distribution $\mu_n^\mathcal{T} = \mu_{Y_n^\mathcal{T}}$.

Working with random fields, given a germ of triangulation $\mathcal{T}$, it is more feasible to study the behaviour of $X_n^\mathcal{T}$ above the translates of only one simplex at a time. We state in this purpose the following lemma:

Lemma 2.1. *Let T be a simplex of $\mathcal{T}$. Put*

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_n^{(T)} &= \left\{ \gamma \mid \frac{1}{n}(\gamma + T) \subset K_d \right\}, \\ H_n^{(T)} &= \frac{1}{n} \left(T + \Gamma_n^{(T)} \right); \\ Y_n^{(T)}(z) &= Y_n(z) \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in H_n^{(T)}\}}, \quad z \in K_d, \\ \mu_n^{(T)} &= \mu_{Y_n^{(T)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for all B in $\mathcal{B}_d$,

$$\mu_n^\mathcal{T}(B) - \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mu_n^{(T)}(B) \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. For $r \geq 0$, call $B(0, r)$ the open ball with radius r and centre 0.

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mu_n^\mathcal{T}(B) - \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mu_n^{(T)}(B) \right| &\leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}, \gamma \in \Gamma_\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\frac{1}{n}(\gamma + T) \cap \partial K_d \neq \emptyset\}} \lambda_d \left(\frac{1}{n}(\gamma + T) \right), \\ &\leq \lambda_d \left(\partial K_d + \frac{1}{n} B(0, \sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \text{diam}(T)) \right), \\ &\leq \frac{C_\mathcal{T}}{n}, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $C_\mathcal{T}$ is a constant depending on $\mathcal{T}$. To be convinced of the last formula, one needs to notice that it is possible to find $q_n = C_d n^{d-1}$ points on ∂K_d $z^1, \dots, z^{q_n}$ (for some constant C_d) such that $\partial K + \frac{1}{n} B(0, C_\mathcal{T})$ is always included in $\bigcup_{i=1}^{q_n} B(z^i, 2C_\mathcal{T}/n)$, where $+$ is the Minkowski addition of sets. $\square$

In conclusion, for the study of a random field X with a germ of triangulation $\mathcal{T}$, the proceeding is the following. For each $T \in \mathcal{T}$, compute the measure $\mu_n^{(T)}$ by studying separately the increment along each edge of simplex T . If the limit $\mu^{(T)}$ exists for each T , then the limit rearrangement is given by the theorem 1.2 with limit measure $\mu^{\mathcal{T}} = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mu_n^{(T)}$.

2.3 Rearrangements of centred Gaussian fields

The specific study of Gaussian fields yields more efficient tools to study the convergence. We give here the statement of the main theorem of this section, some examples will be derived in the next section to illustrate the theory, for multivariate Lévy and Chentsov fields. The generalised Lorenz curve plays a great role in the convex rearrangement of Gaussian processes, so we introduce it now.

Definition 2.1. *Call γ_d the d -dimensional standard normal distribution. The d -dimensional generalised Lorenz curve is*

$$GL_d = \mathbf{C}_{\gamma_d}.$$

In other words, it is the asymptotic convex rearrangement of any field which renormalised gradient measure converges to γ_d . It corresponds in dimension 1 to the classical Lorenz curve, frequently used in the fields of finance and econometrics.

Following lemma 2.1, choose T a simplex of $\mathcal{T}$. Here $Y_n^{(T)}$ is the gradient of $X_n^{(T)}$. Call $\Lambda_n^{(T)}(z) = \text{cov}(Y_n^{(T)}(z))$ Let us translate the results of proposition 2.1 for Gaussian fields.

Proposition 2.2. *Assume that (10) is fulfilled and that for all z there exists a matrix $\Lambda^{(T)}(z)$ such that*

$$\Lambda_n^{(T)}(z) \rightarrow \Lambda^{(T)}(z) \tag{16}$$

(which is equivalent to (11) in the Gaussian case). Let $\mu_z^{(T)}$ be the Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with covariance matrix $\Lambda^{(T)}(z), z \in K_d$. Then, the only possible limit probability measure $\mu^{(T)}$ is the Gaussian mixture

$$\mu^{(T)}(B) = \int_{K_d} \mu_z^{(T)}(B) dz, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}_d.$$

We state now the main theorem of this paper, which gives a more efficient condition for the convergence of $\mu_n^{(T)} = \mu_{Y_n^{(T)}}$ than theorem 2.1. We first state the technical optimal result, and then give the corollary that will be our main tool for rearranging random fields.

Theorem 2.2. *Let X be a Gaussian centred field on K_d , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and T a regular simplex of K_d admitting $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{u}^i)_{i=1}^d$ as orthonormal basis. Define $\mu_n^{(T)}$ as the distribution of $Y_n^{(T)}$ and $\varphi_n^{(T)}$ is its characteristic function. Then there is a deterministic sequence c_n of order $O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ that satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(|\varphi_n^{(T)}(h) - \mathbb{E}(\varphi_n^{(T)}(h)) - c_n|^4) \\ &= O\left(\int_{(K_d)^2} dz d\zeta e^{-\langle h, (\Lambda_n^{(T)}(z) + \Lambda_n^{(T)}(\zeta))h \rangle} \sup_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} |\mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z)Y_{n,j}(\zeta))|\right)^2, \quad h \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The proof is in Section 5.2. In all the cases treated here, this result gives us the convergence of the sequence of random measure $\mu_n^{(T)}$ to the limit $\mu^{(T)}$, if it exists. The deterministic term c_n is an effect of the problems occurring at the border, see lemma 2.1.

A more handful version of previous result is the following corollary, which gives the convergence for many random centred Gaussian fields with piece-wise smooth covariance function.

Corollary 2.1. *Let X be a centred Gaussian field, and $\mathcal{T}$ a germ of triangulation. Call Γ the covariance function of field X . We set Θ the set of all pair of points in $(K_d)^2$ upon which Γ is not of class C^1 . If (16) is fulfilled for each simplex T in $\mathcal{T}$ and the following holds,*

$$\sum_n \frac{1}{b_n^4} < \infty, \quad (18)$$

$$\sum_n \left(\frac{1}{n^{2d}} |\Theta \cap H_n^{\mathcal{T}}| \right)^2 < \infty, \quad (19)$$

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}, z \in K_d} \|\Lambda_n^{(T)}(z)\| < \infty, \quad (20)$$

then we have, with probability 1,

$$\mu_n^{\mathcal{T}} \Rightarrow \mu^{\mathcal{T}}, \quad \mathfrak{M}Y_n \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_{\mu^{\mathcal{T}}}, \quad \frac{1}{b_n} \mathfrak{C}X_n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_{\mu^{\mathcal{T}}}. \quad (21)$$

where $\mu^{\mathcal{T}} = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mu^{(T)}$.

Proof. Take $T \in \mathcal{T}$, and $\mathbf{u}$ a basis of T . For $(z, \zeta) \notin \Theta$, call $d\Gamma_{z, \zeta}$ the differential

form of Γ in (z, ζ) . We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \forall 1 \leq i, j \leq d, (z, \zeta) \in (H_n^{(T)})^2 \setminus \Theta, \\
& \mathbb{E} \left(Y_{n,i}^{(T)}(z) Y_{n,j}^{(T)}(\zeta) \right) \\
&= \frac{n^2}{b_n^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(X(z + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^i) - X(z) \right) \left(X(\zeta + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^j) - X(\zeta) \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{n^2}{b_n^2} \left(\Gamma \left(z + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^i, \zeta + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^j \right) - \Gamma \left(z + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^i, \zeta \right) - \Gamma \left(z, \zeta + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^j \right) + \Gamma(z, \zeta) \right) \\
&= \frac{n^2}{b_n^2} \left(d\Gamma_{z,\zeta} \left(\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^i, \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^j \right) - d\Gamma_{z,\zeta} \left(\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^i, 0 \right) - d\Gamma_{z,\zeta} \left(0, \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^j \right) + O \left(\frac{1}{n^2} \right) \right) \\
&= O \left(\frac{1}{b_n^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The others (z, ζ) , where Γ is not regular, are supposed to be negligible, and we have the following upper bound :

$$\mathbb{E} \left(Y_{n,i}^{(T)}(z) Y_{n,j}^{(T)}(\zeta) \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left(Y_{n,i}^{(T)}(z)^2 \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(Y_{n,j}^{(T)}(\zeta)^2 \right)$$

which is uniformly bounded by hypothesis. In consequence, due to the previous theorem, with $t_n = \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{n} T \right)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{(K_d)^2} e^{-\langle h, (\text{cov}(Y_n^{(T)}(z)) + \text{cov}(Y_n^{(T)}(\zeta))) h \rangle} \sup_{i,j} \left| \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}^{(T)}(z) \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,j}^{(T)}(\zeta))) \right| dz d\zeta = \\
& O \left(\frac{1}{b_n^2} \right) + O \left(\sum_{(z,\zeta) \in (H_n^{(T)})^2 \cap \Theta} t_n^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We easily check that $t_n^2 = O \left(\frac{1}{n^{2d}} \right)$ and so, using theorem 2.2, we have, for a constant C

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left(|\varphi_n^{(T)}(h) - \mathbb{E}(\varphi_n^{(T)}(h)) - c_n|^4 \right) \leq C \sum_{n \geq 1} \left(\frac{1}{b_n^2} + \frac{\left| (H_n^{(T)})^2 \cap \Theta \right|}{n^{2d}} \right)^2 < \infty.$$

Due to Borel-Cantelli's lemma, a.s $\varphi_n^{(T)}(h) - \mathbb{E}(\varphi_n^{(T)}(h)) - c_n \rightarrow 0$, for each $T \in \mathcal{T}$. (Remember that c_n is a deterministic sequence in $O(1/n)$). Since by hypothesis $\mathbb{E}(\varphi_n^{(T)}(h)) \rightarrow \varphi^{(T)}(h)$ for each T , we have the convergence of $\varphi_n(h)$ to $\varphi(h)$ with probability 1, for each h in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Lemma 1.1 and theorem 1.2 carry the conclusion. $\square$

Theorem 2.1 only allowed an upper bound of order $\frac{1}{n}$, but with the last expression one is often able to derive a summable upper bound. The scope of this article is the study of Gaussian fields, but one could probably compute the quantity $\mathbb{E}(|\varphi_n(h) - \mathbb{E}(\varphi_n(h))|^4)$ for a wider class of fields and obtain an upper bound better than $\frac{1}{n}$, at least for processes with low-dependant increments.

3 Examples

Write $\Sigma_d = \left\{ (t_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} \mid 0 \leq t_i \leq 1, \sum_{i=1}^d t_i \leq 1 \right\}$ the elementary simplex of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Given z in $\mathbb{R}^d$, an orthonormal basis $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{u}^i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and a positive number l , define the regular simplex with summit z , basis $\mathbf{u}$, and side-length l as

$$T(z, \mathbf{u}, l) = z + l\rho_{\mathbf{u}}(\Sigma_d),$$

where $\rho_{\mathbf{u}}$ is a rotation of $\mathbb{R}^d$ transforming $\mathbf{e}$ into $\mathbf{u}$. If $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{e}$, T is said to be "straight". If $l = 1$, T is said to be "regular".

There is a large literature in the 1-dimensional case. Corollary 2.1 enables us to retrieve partially some results.

Theorem 3.1. *Let X be a 1-dimensional Gaussian centred process with stationary increments, put $\sigma^2(t) = \mathbb{E}(X(t)^2)$. We set $b_n = n\sigma(\frac{1}{n})$ and make the following assumptions*

$$\sum_n \frac{1}{b_n^4} < \infty, \tag{22}$$

$$\sigma^2 \text{ is piece-wise of class } \mathcal{C}^1. \tag{23}$$

Then,

$$\frac{1}{b_n} \mathfrak{C} X_n \rightarrow GL_1.$$

Proof. By stationarity

$$\mathbb{E}(X'_n(z)^2) = \mathbb{E}(X'_n(0)^2) = n^2 \sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} \right),$$

and so we put $Y_n = \frac{1}{b_n} X'_n$. Then, for all z , $\text{cov}(Y_n(z)) = \text{cov}(Y_n(0))$ converges to 1, and (16) is satisfied with $\Lambda(z) = 1$. So, the candidate for the limit, given by (12), is γ_1 . Also, $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\text{cov} Y_n(0)| < \infty$ and (20) is satisfied. Condition (18) is also satisfied by hypothesis. To check (19), we call E the finite set of points upon which σ^2 is not of class $\mathcal{C}^1$. We have

$$\Theta = \{(s, s+y) \mid s \in [0, 1], y \in E\}.$$

Now, $|\Theta \cap H_n^2| = |E| |H_n| = O(n)$, so (19) is also satisfied, and a.s $\mu_n \Rightarrow \gamma_1$.

Now, GL_1 is indeed the convex function whose gradient distribution is γ_1 , and theorem 1.2 gives the conclusion. $\square$

Davydov and Thilly [5], along with a general theorem concerning Gaussian processes with stationary increments, have obtained the following result for the fractional Brownian motion:

Theorem 3.2 (Davydov, Thilly 98). *Let $0 < \alpha < 2$, and W^α be the standard fractional Brownian motion. Then*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n^{1-\alpha/2}} \mathfrak{C}W_n^\alpha - GL_1 \right\|_\infty^{[0,1]} \rightarrow 0.$$

In this case, the covariance function $\sigma^2(t) = |t|^\alpha$ is non differentiable only in 0. We set $b_n = n^{1-\alpha/2}$, and $\frac{1}{b_n^\alpha}$ is summable iff $\alpha \in]0, \frac{3}{2}[$. Hence theorem 3.1 retrieves the result for $0 < \alpha < 3/2$. This gives us the convex rearrangement of Brownian motion, first stated by Davydov and Vershik [6], who furthermore obtained uniform convergence on $[0, 1]$.

Now we present some multi-dimensional examples, which give an idea of the variety of possible phenomena that can occur.

3.1 Lévy field

The Lévy field is the first multivariate random field that we study. In dimension $d \geq 1$, it is defined as the only centred Gaussian random field with covariance function

$$\Gamma(z, \zeta) = \frac{1}{2}(\|z\| + \|\zeta\| - \|z - \zeta\|).$$

It is spherically symmetric and its 1-dimensional version is the standard Brownian motion.

Let X be a Lévy field. We use the notation of section 2.2. Let us take an arbitrary simplex $T = T(z_0, \mathbf{u}, 1)$ in $(\mathbb{R}_+)^d$. Then, the covariance matrix of $\nabla X_n^{(T)}(z)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}(\nabla X_n^{(T)}(z))_{i,j} &= \frac{1}{2n}(\|\mathbf{u}^i\| + \|\mathbf{u}^j\| - \|\mathbf{u}^i - \mathbf{u}^j\|) + o(1) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n}(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} + o(1)) & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ \frac{1}{n} & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

A first observation is that the covariance matrix does not depend on the choice of orthonormal basis $\mathbf{u}$. It is not surprising, given the spherical symmetry of the field. But since the covariance matrix was computed in basis $\mathbf{u}$, the limit distribution does depend on $\mathbf{u}$. We set

$$\Lambda = \begin{cases} b_n = \sqrt{n}, \\ C = 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \\ \Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & C & \dots & C \\ C & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & & C \\ C & \dots & C & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \end{cases}$$

and let μ be the Gaussian distribution with covariance matrix Λ in basis $\mathbf{u}$. The matrix Λ admits $1 - C$ as eigenvalue of multiplicity $d - 1$, associated to eigenspace $(1, \dots, 1)^\perp$, and $(n-1)C + 1$ as eigenvalue of multiplicity 1, associated to eigenvector $(1, \dots, 1)$.

Since $\left| \Theta \cap (H_n^{(T)})^2 \right| = O(n^d)$, using corollary 2.1 and theorem 1.2, we have the three usual results

$$\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu, \quad \frac{1}{b_n} \mathfrak{M} \nabla X_n \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_\mu, \quad \frac{1}{b_n} \mathfrak{C} X_n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_\mu.$$

The asymptotic rearrangement is consistent under the action of rotations: Indeed, if $\mu^\mathcal{T}$ is the limit measure with germ of triangulation $\mathcal{T}$, we have for all rotation ρ and germ of triangulation $\mathcal{T}$, $\mu^{\rho(\mathcal{T})} = \mu^\mathcal{T} \rho^{-1}$. This is due to the symmetry property of the Lévy field, and will not be the case in the subsequent examples.

3.2 An additive Gaussian field

Define $X(x, y) = W(x) + W(y)$ on K_2 , where W is a standard Brownian motion. We use the notation of section 2.2. Let $\mathcal{T}_0$ be the germ of triangulation of K_2 consisting of the natural simplex $T_0 = T(0, \mathbf{e}, 1)$ and T'_0 its symmetric with respect to $(1/2, 1/2)$. In particular, $\mathcal{T}_0$ is a triangulation of K_2 itself. Relation (14) is satisfied with the network $\mathbb{Z}^2$. According to proposition 1.1 and theorem 3.1,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathfrak{C} X_n^{(\mathcal{T}_0)} \rightarrow GL_2.$$

Now we will see that with another germ of triangulation that is not a triangulation of K_2 , which in particular does not admit $\mathbb{Z}^2$ as a network, the asymptotic convex rearrangement is different.

Call ρ the clockwise rotation of $\mathbb{R}^2$ with angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$, and consider the new germ of triangulation $\mathcal{T} = \rho(\mathcal{T}_0)$ defined by

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u} = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 + e_2), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-e_1 + e_2) \right), \\ T = T((0, 0), \mathbf{u}, 1), \\ T' = T((0, \sqrt{2}), -\mathbf{u}, 1), \\ \mathcal{T} = \{T, T'\}. \end{cases}$$

The set of triangles $\mathcal{T}$ fulfils condition (14), and admits $\Gamma_\mathcal{T} = u_1\mathbb{Z} + u_2\mathbb{Z}$ as network (as well as $\sqrt{2}e_1\mathbb{Z} + u_1\mathbb{Z}$, and others).

Theorem 3.3. *Put $b_n^2 = \sqrt{2}n$. Then,*

$$\mu_n^\mathcal{T} \Rightarrow \mu \text{ almost surely,}$$

where μ is the centred Gaussian distribution with covariance matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ in basis $\mathbf{u}$. So we have, according to theorem 1.2,

$$a.s, \frac{1}{b_n} \mathfrak{M} \nabla X_n \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_\mu, \frac{1}{b_n} \mathfrak{C} X_n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_\mu,$$

on $\text{int}(K_d)$.

Proof. Let us take $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z = (x, y) \in H_n^2$. Let us write the coordinates of $\nabla X_n^{(T)}$ in the basis $\mathbf{u}$:

$$\begin{aligned} X_{n,1}^{(T)}(z) &= W\left(x + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}\right) + W\left(y + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}\right) - W(x) - W(y), \\ X_{n,2}^{(T)}(z) &= W\left(x - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}\right) + W\left(y + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}\right) - W(x) - W(y). \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{cov}\left(\nabla X_n^{(T)}(z)\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{if } x - y \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{n}.$$

For T' :

$$\begin{aligned} X_{n,1}^{(T')}(z) &= W\left(x + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}\right) + W\left(y - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}\right) - W(x) - W(y), \\ X_{n,2}^{(T')}(z) &= W\left(x - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}\right) + W\left(y - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}\right) - W(x) - W(y). \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{cov}\left(\nabla X_n^{(T')}(z)\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{if } x - y \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{n}.$$

Hence we set

$$\begin{aligned} b_n^2 &= \sqrt{2n}, \\ \Lambda(z) &= \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad z \in K_d. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{cov}(Y_n(z))$ converges to $\Lambda(z)$ almost everywhere on K_d , the candidate μ for the limit distribution is the centred Gaussian distribution with covariance matrix $\Lambda(0)$ in basis $\mathbf{u}$. We now have to verify hypotheses of corollary 2.1 to have the convergence $\mu_n^{\mathcal{T}} \Rightarrow \mu$.

The sum $\sum_n \frac{1}{b_n^4} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_n \frac{1}{n^2}$ is finite. The covariance function of X is

$$\Gamma((x, y), (x', y')) = x \wedge x' + x \wedge y' + y \wedge x' + y \wedge y'.$$

Using notations of corollary 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta &= \{(x, y), (x', y') | x = x' \text{ or } x = y' \text{ or } x' = y \text{ or } x = y'\}, \\ |\Theta \cap H_n^{\mathcal{T}^2}| &= O(n^3).\end{aligned}$$

Concerning condition 20, we have to majorise $\|\text{cov}(\nabla X_n^{(S)}(x, y))\|$ for $S \in \{T, T'\}$ when x and y are close. Instead of studying all the cases, we make the following remark. This is the covariance matrix of the variables $\delta_1 + \delta_2$ and $\delta_3 + \delta_4$, where the δ_i are Gaussian variables with variance $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}$. Hence, whatever is the dependance between δ_i 's, in all cases, each component of the covariance matrix will be bounded by $\frac{4}{\sqrt{2n}}$, which is the uniform bound we were looking for. So, using corollary 2.1,

$$a.s., \mu_n^{\mathcal{T}} \Rightarrow \mu,$$

and the result is proved. $\square$

This time, the triangulation matters in the limit distribution. Seeing the field under another angle, by rotating the simplexes that generate the triangulation, induce a radical change in the gradient distribution of the polygonal regularisation. More precisely, if ρ is the rotation applied to triangulation $\mathcal{T}_0$ to get triangulation $\mathcal{T}$, it does not suffice anymore to rotate μ under ρ to have the new limit measure. This phenomenon illustrates the complex nature of rearrangement for multi-dimensional fields, in contrast with one-dimensional fields.

3.3 Chentsov field

This section is devoted to the study of Chentsov field. As the Lévy field, it is an irregular centred Gaussian field. Like in the previous example, the nature of the asymptotic convex rearrangement strongly depends on the choice of the triangulation. For z and ζ two elements of $\mathbb{R}^d$, denote by $z \wedge \zeta$ the vector which coordinates are the point-wise minimum coordinates of z and ζ , and $\underline{z}$ is the product of coordinates of z . The Chentsov field is defined on $(\mathbb{R}_+)^d$ as the Gaussian field with covariance function $\Gamma(z, \zeta) = \underline{z \wedge \zeta}$. Here, we use the notation of section 2.2, where X is a Gaussian field.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{u}^i)_{i=1}^d$ be an orthonormal basis and $T = T(0, \mathbf{u}, 1)$ a regular simplex of $(\mathbb{R}_+)^d$. We define*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{u}_{i,j} &= \mathbf{u}^i \wedge \mathbf{u}^j - \mathbf{u}^i \wedge 0 - \mathbf{u}^j \wedge 0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \\ l(z) &= (z_2 \dots z_d, z_1 z_3 \dots z_d, \dots, z_1 \dots z_{d-1}), \quad z \in K_d, \\ \Lambda^{(\mathbf{u})}(z)_{i,j} &= \langle l(z), \mathbf{u}_{i,j} \rangle, \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}.\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

We call $\mu^{(\mathbf{u})}$ the mixture of the Gaussian probability measures with covariances $\Lambda^{(\mathbf{u})}(z)$, $z \in K_d$, and $\varphi^{(\mathbf{u})}$ its characteristic function. We have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \varphi_n^{(T)}(h) - \varphi^{(\mathbf{u})}(h) \right|^4 \right) = O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right), \quad h \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proof. We will use proposition 2.2 to compute the only possible limit and corollary 2.1 to show the almost sure convergence.

Let $z \in H_n^{(T)}$, and $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\nabla X_{n,i}(z) \nabla X_{n,j}(z)) &= n^2 \mathbb{E}((X(z + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^i) - X(z))(X(z + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^j) - X(z))) \\ &= n^2 \left(\underbrace{(z + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^i) \wedge (z + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^j)} - \underbrace{(z + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^i) \wedge z} - \underbrace{z \wedge (z + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^j)} + \underline{z} \right) \\ &= n^2 \left(\underbrace{(z + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^i \wedge \mathbf{u}^j)} - \underbrace{(z + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^i \wedge 0)} - \underbrace{(z + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^j \wedge 0)} + \underline{z} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Consider now the function Π on $\mathbb{R}^d$ defined by $\Pi(z) = \underline{z}$. It admits, for all $z, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the development

$$\Pi(z + h) = (z_1 + h_1) \dots (z_d + h_d) = \Pi(z) + \langle l(z), h \rangle + q(z, h),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}l(z) &= (z_2 \dots z_d, z_1 z_3 \dots z_d, \dots, z_1 \dots z_{d-1}), \\ q(z, h) &\leq \gamma(z) \|h\|^2\end{aligned}$$

for some positive continuous function γ . It is hence possible to majorise uniformly γ by a constant C . Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}(\nabla X_{n,i}(z) \nabla X_{n,j}(z)) = n^2 \left\langle l(z), \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^i \wedge \mathbf{u}^j - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^i \wedge 0 - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{u}^j \wedge 0 \right\rangle + q\left(z, \frac{\mathbf{u}_{ij}}{n^2}\right).$$

So, we take

$$\begin{aligned}b_n &= \sqrt{n}, \\ Y_n &= \frac{1}{b_n} \nabla X_n, \\ \mathbf{u}_{i,j} &= \mathbf{u}^i \wedge \mathbf{u}^j - \mathbf{u}^i \wedge 0 - \mathbf{u}^j \wedge 0, \\ \Lambda^{(\mathbf{u})}(z)_{i,j} &= \langle l(z), \mathbf{u}_{i,j} \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

so that we have

$$\|\Lambda_n(z) - \Lambda^{(\mathbf{u})}(z)\| \leq \frac{C}{n^2}$$

Conditions (16) and (20) are satisfied.

Then, according to proposition 2.2, the limit distribution $\mu^{(T)}$, if it exists, has characteristic function

$$\varphi^{(T)}(h) = \int_{K_d} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \langle h, \Lambda^{(\mathbf{u})}(z) h \rangle} \mathrm{d}z.$$

Now, we have $\Theta = \{(z, \zeta) \in K_d \mid z_i \neq \zeta_i, 1 \leq i \leq d\}$, so that Γ is of class $\mathcal{C}^1$ on $(K_d)^2 \setminus \Theta$. Since $\left| \left(H_n^{(T)} \right)^2 \cap \Theta \right| = O(n^{2d-1})$, using corollary 2.1 we have

$$\mu_n^{(T)} \Rightarrow \mu^{(T)}.$$

□

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a germ of triangulation. Let $\mu^\mathcal{T} = \bigotimes_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mu^{(T)}$. Then we have, with probability 1,

$$\mu_n^\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mu, \quad \frac{1}{b_n} \mathfrak{M} \nabla X_n^\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_{\mu^\mathcal{T}}, \quad \frac{1}{b_n} \mathfrak{C} X_n^\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_{\mu^\mathcal{T}}.$$

Finding the expression of $\mathbf{C}_{\mu^\mathcal{T}}$ is not an easy task, and in general we were not able to derive explicit formulas. We present here a tractable expression for the 2-dimensional Chentsov field with the germ of triangulation $\mathcal{T}_0 = \{T(0, \mathbf{e}, 1), T(0, -\mathbf{e}, 1)\}$ introduced in section 3.2.

With the notation of theorem 3.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_{1,1} &= \mathbf{e}_1, \\ \mathbf{e}_{1,2} &= \mathbf{e}_{2,1} = 0, \\ \mathbf{e}_{2,2} &= \mathbf{e}_2, \\ (-\mathbf{e})_{1,1} &= \mathbf{e}_1, \\ (-\mathbf{e})_{1,2} &= (-\mathbf{e})_{2,1} = 0, \\ (-\mathbf{e})_{2,2} &= \mathbf{e}_2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that in this case, we might as well have taken $-\mathbf{e}$ as basis of $T(0, \mathbf{e}, 1)$ or $\mathbf{e}$ as basis of $T(0, -\mathbf{e}, 1)$, but it does not change the result. We have the relief to realise that the result does not depend on the choice of the simplex bases. Hence we set

$$\begin{aligned} l(x, y) &= (y, x), \\ \Lambda^{(\mathbf{u})}(x, y) &= \begin{pmatrix} y & 0 \\ 0 & x \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $C_{a,b} = [-\infty, a] \times [-\infty, b]$ be a rectangle of $\mathcal{B}_2$, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. We are looking for the expression of the asymptotic convex rearrangement $\mathbf{C}_{\mu^{\tau_0}}$, which is the unique convex function null in 0 that satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_d((\nabla \mathbf{C}_{\mu^{\tau_0}})^{-1}(C_{a,b})) &= \int_{C_{a,b}} dh \int_{K_2} \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}(h_1^2/y + h_2^2/x)}}{\sqrt{xy}} dx dy, \\ &= G(a)G(b), \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where

$$G(a) = \int_{-\infty}^a dh \int_0^1 \frac{e^{-\frac{h^2}{2x}}}{\sqrt{x}} dx, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It is an increasing bijection from $\mathbb{R}$ to $[0, 1]$. In consequence, we define $\mathbf{C}_{\mu\tau_0}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_1(x) &= \int_0^x G^{-1}(t) dt \\ \mathbf{C}_{\mu\tau_0}(x, y) &= (\mathbf{C}_1(x), \mathbf{C}_1(y)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{C}_1$ is convex, so is $\mathbf{C}_{\mu\tau_0}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\nabla \mathbf{C}_{\mu\tau_0}}(C_{a,b}) &= \int_{K_2} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{C}'_1(x) \leq a} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{C}'_1(y) \leq b} dx dy = \int_{K_2} \mathbf{1}_{G^{-1}(x) \leq a} \mathbf{1}_{G^{-1}(y) \leq b} dx dy \\ &= G(a)G(b). \end{aligned}$$

$\mathbf{C}_{\mu\tau_0}$ indeed satisfies (25).

This function is hence the asymptotic convex rearrangement of X . As in example 3.2, it can be represented as the sum of two versions of a 1-dimensional function

$$\mathbf{C}_{\mu\tau_0} = \mathbf{C}_1 \oplus \mathbf{C}_1. \quad (26)$$

Nevertheless X cannot be written as the sum of two processes $X = X_1 \oplus X_2$, each having asymptotic convex rearrangement $\mathbf{C}_1$, on the contrary of the example at section 3.2. Also, this $\oplus$ -factorisation is the exclusivity of the 2-dimensional case, and is due to the fact that $l(z)$, defined in (24), does not involve products of coordinates $z_i z_j$ if and only if $d \leq 2$.

Also we show that the asymptotic convex rearrangement of X is in some sense the $\oplus$ -sum of the average convex rearrangement of the integrated Brownian motion. Indeed, let X_1 be an integrated Brownian motion. It does not have a deterministic convex rearrangement since it is a smooth random function, but its gradient distribution satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \mu_{\nabla(X_1 \oplus X_1)}(B) = \mu_{\nabla(\mathbf{C}_1 \oplus \mathbf{C}_1)}(B) = \mu_{\nabla \mathbf{C}_{\mu\tau_0}}(C_{a,b})(B), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}_d. \quad (27)$$

Proof. With the previous notations, for a cylinder $B = [-\infty, a] \times [-\infty, b]$, since X'_1 is a standard Brownian motion,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \mu_{\nabla(X_1 \oplus X_1)}(B) &= \int_0^1 \mathbb{P}(X'_1(x) \leq a) dx \int_0^1 \mathbb{P}(X'_1(y) \leq b) dy, \\ &= G(a)G(b), \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. $\square$

The one-dimensional vertical and horizontal restrictions of 2-dimensional Chentsov field X are re-scaled Brownian motions, but due to the statistical dependance of distant points, its asymptotic convex rearrangement looks more like that of a sum of one-dimensional integrated Brownian motions, in the sense of (27). Hence the long-range dependancy effects can also have a strong influence on the asymptotic convex rearrangement.

4 Discussion

In this article we developed tools for computing the asymptotic convex rearrangements of some random fields. We observed that there was a strong dependancy on the choice of the triangulation used for approximating the field. In [5], it becomes apparent that for some 1-dimensional Gaussian processes, the Lorenz curve seems a “universal” asymptotic convex rearrangement, in the sense that it is the same for polygonal and convoluted approximations. In the multivariate case, one would like to do the same, associate to each field a unique convex object. For the Lévy field and the Gaussian field studied in section 3.2 (a $\oplus$ -sum of Gaussian processes), the range of possible limit distributions seem to be a wide class of nondegenerate Gaussian distributions, and it would be interesting to find a structure in it. This is an ambitious program, and the next step is to investigate asymptotic convex rearrangement with other methods of approximation, such as convolution, and other ways of representing the asymptotic convex object, like the associated convex body, or the Blaschke sum of small convex sets involved in the graph of the field approximation.

5 Proofs

5.1 Proof of theorem 1.2

Without loss of generality, we suppose f_n and f convex. It allows us to omit $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{C}$ in the writing.

(6) clearly implies (7).

The implication (7) $\Rightarrow$ (6) follows from the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let K be a compact convex set, and (f_n) a sequence of convex functions that converge point-wise to a convex continuous function f on K . Then ∇f_n converges to ∇f for the $\mathcal{L}^1$ norm on each convex compact subset of $\text{int}(K)$.*

Proof of lemma 5.1. We will prove the lemma in three steps.

Equilipschitzian convex functions on $[0, 1]$: For $\kappa > 0$, we put $\mathcal{C}_\kappa$ the set of κ -lipschitzian convex functions on $[0, 1]$. We are going to show the result in the case where f and the (f_n) are in $\mathcal{C}_\kappa$. In this case, we pick a dense countable subset $S = \{x_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in $[0, 1]$. Since the f'_n are bounded (by κ), by the

diagonal sub-sequence method, we can find a sub-sequence $f'_{\sigma(n)}$ such that, for all k , $f'_{\sigma(n)}(x_k)$ converges to some value $g(x_k)$, where g is increasing on S . Call also g its unique right-continuous increasing continuation on $[0, 1]$, we will show that f'_n converges to g on $[0, 1]$ for the $\mathcal{L}^1$ norm. Let x be a continuity point of g and $\epsilon > 0$. Then, let y and z be in S such that $|g(y) - g(z)| \leq \epsilon$ and $y \leq x \leq z$. For n large enough, since the f'_n are increasing,

$$\begin{aligned} -2\epsilon &\leq g(x) - g(z) + g(z) - f'_n(z) \leq g(x) - f'_n(x) \\ &\leq g(x) - g(y) + g(y) - f'_n(y) \leq 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence f'_n converges to g in each of its continuity points, i.e almost everywhere according to Riesz-Nagy theorem. Since g is bounded (by κ), f'_n converges to g for the $\mathcal{L}^1$ norm (Lebesgue theorem). By integration, g equals f' a.e and so we have the result.

Convex functions on $[0,1]$: We drop here the assumption that the f_n are equilipschitzian. Let $I = [a, b]$ be a compact subinterval of $]0, 1[$. Then, for each f_n , for any x in I , we have, by convexity,

$$\frac{f_n(a) - f_n(0)}{a} \leq f'_n(x) \leq \frac{f_n(1) - f_n(b)}{1 - b}.$$

Since the left and right hand terms converge to finite values when n goes to ∞ , the f_n are equilipschitzian on I , and using the previous result, f'_n converges to f' for the $\mathcal{L}^1$ norm on I .

Convex functions on $\mathbf{K}$: Let $I_j, 1 \leq j \leq d$ be compact intervals of $\mathbb{R}$ such that $C = I_1 \times \dots \times I_d$ is a compact rectangle contained in $\text{int}(K)$. Let us put, for z in $I_1 \times \dots \times I_{d-1}$, $I_z = \{z\} \times I_d$. For such z , $1 \leq i \leq d$, define $G_{n,z,i}(x) = \nabla f_{n,i}(z, x) - \nabla f_i(z, x)$ on I_d , and $C_{n,i}(z) = \|G_{n,z,i}\|_{\mathcal{L}^1}^d$. Now we have, with Fubini's theorem,

$$\|\nabla f_n - \nabla f\|_{\mathcal{L}^1}^C = \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{I_1 \times \dots \times I_{d-1}} C_{n,i}(z) dz.$$

Since f_n uniformly converges to f on K , it also does on a segment J_z which interior contains I_z . Each integrand $C_{n,i}(z)$ converges point-wise to 0 due to the previous result. To dominate it, we write $I_z = [a_z, b_z]$, and call c_z a point in I_z where the monotone function $\nabla f_{n,i}(z, \cdot)$ reaches 0, or $c_z = a_z$ (arbitrarily) if 0 is not reached. Then, using the monotonicity of $\nabla f_{n,i}(z, \cdot)$, we have

$$C_{n,i}(z) \leq \|f_n(a_z)\| + \|f_n(b_z)\| + 2\|f_n(c_z)\| \leq 4\|f_n\|_{\infty}^C \leq 4\|f\|_{\infty}^C + o(1).$$

The last upper bound is due to the fact that the point-wise convergence of f_n to f on the convex C yields uniform convergence. So, Lebesgue's theorem gives us the conclusion:

$$\|\nabla f_n - \nabla f\|_{\mathcal{L}^1}^C \rightarrow 0.$$

Now, each convex compact subset C of $\text{int}(K)$ is contained in a finite union of such rectangles, and we have the conclusion. $\square$

proof of (6) $\Rightarrow$ (5).

Let $(K_\epsilon, \epsilon > 0)$ be an increasing family of compact convex sets which satisfy

$$\bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} K_\epsilon = \text{int}(K).$$

Let A be a continuity set for μ , and let $\alpha > 0$. Take $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mu(K_\epsilon^c) < \alpha$, and n after which $|\mu_{\nabla f_n^\epsilon}(A) - \mu_{\nabla f^\epsilon}(A)| \leq \alpha$ (A is also a continuity set for $\mu_{\nabla f^\epsilon}$ because $\mu_{\nabla f^\epsilon}(\partial A) \leq \mu_{\nabla f}(\partial A) = 0$). Then,

$$|\mu_{\nabla f_n}(A) - \mu_{\nabla f}(A)| \leq \lambda_d(K_\epsilon^c) + |\mu_{\nabla f_n^\epsilon}(A) - \mu_{\nabla f^\epsilon}(A)| \leq 2\alpha,$$

and it shows that $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$.

Let us now show (5) $\Rightarrow$ (6).

This result comes from the structure of convex functions, and of their gradient, the “monotone functions”, so we first state a result that helps us apprehend the topography of a monotone function.

Lemma 5.2. *There is a class $(K_\epsilon)_{\epsilon > 0}$ of closed subsets of K , satisfying*

$$(i) \ \epsilon > \epsilon' \Rightarrow K_\epsilon \subset K_{\epsilon'},$$

$$(ii) \ \bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} K_\epsilon = \text{int}(K),$$

$$(iii) \ \text{For any convex function } f, \text{ positive number } A \text{ and } \epsilon > 0,$$

$$\mu_{\|\nabla f\|}([A, \infty]) \leq \epsilon \Rightarrow \forall z \in K_\epsilon, \|\nabla f(z)\| \leq 2A.$$

Hence one can control the locations of points where f 's gradient reaches high values. In particular, $\|\nabla f\|$ cannot be “too large” far from the edges of K .

Proof. Any convex function f on K satisfies

$$\forall z, \zeta \in K, \langle \nabla f(z) - \nabla f(\zeta), z - \zeta \rangle \geq 0.$$

It readily follows from the fact that the restriction of f to $[z, \zeta]$ is convex. Now, for $z \in K, u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we introduce the affine cone

$$Z(z, u) = \{y \in K_d \mid \langle y - z, u \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2}\|z - y\|\|u\|\}.$$

We have the property that

$$y \in Z(z, \nabla f(z)) \Rightarrow \|\nabla f(y)\| \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(z)\|.$$

Indeed, let y be in $Z(z, \nabla f(z))$.

$$\|\nabla f(y)\| \|y - z\| \geq \langle \nabla f(y), y - z \rangle \geq \langle \nabla f(z), y - z \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(z)\| \|y - z\|.$$

That means that the y in the cone $Z(z, \nabla f(z))$ cannot have a too small gradient, due to the monotonicity property.

Now we set $\epsilon(z) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}} \lambda_d(Z(z, u))$, which simply plays the role of a lower bound for $\lambda_d(Z(z, \nabla f(z)))$. We have, for $z \in K$,

$$\lambda_d(\{y \in K \mid \|\nabla f(y)\| \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(z)\|\}) \geq \lambda_d(Z(z, \nabla f(z))) \geq \epsilon(z). \quad (28)$$

Now we set, for $\epsilon > 0$, $K_\epsilon = \{z \in K \mid \epsilon(z) \geq \epsilon\}$. For z in K_ϵ ,

$$\|\nabla f(z)\| \geq 2A \Rightarrow \mu_{\|\nabla f\|}([A, \infty]) \geq \epsilon(z).$$

Hence, given any positive number A , if ∇f satisfies

$$\mu_{\|\nabla f_n\|}([A, \infty]) \leq \alpha,$$

then, according to (28), it follows that for $z \in K_\alpha$

$$\epsilon(z) \geq \alpha, \text{ and so } \|\nabla f(z)\| \leq 2A.$$

□

We hence have to show that f_n converges to f on $\text{int}(K)$. In a first time we will use Ascoli-Arzelà theorem to show that the f_n uniformly converge on every K_ϵ , and by consistency they converge point-wise on $\text{int}(K)$. Then we will show that the limit can be nothing but f .

Since $\mu_{\nabla f_n}$ weakly converges to μ_f , it is a tight family of measures. For all $\epsilon > 0$, we can find $A > 0$ such that, for all n in $\mathbb{N}$,

$$\mu_{\|\nabla f_n\|}([A, \infty]) \leq \epsilon.$$

Hence, according to lemma 5.2,

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall z \in K_\epsilon, \|\nabla f_n(z)\| \leq 2A.$$

According to Ascoli-Arzelà criterion, we know that for all $\epsilon > 0$, $\{f_n(z); z \in K_\epsilon\}$ is a relatively compact family for the uniform convergence. Now, let ϵ be a positive number. There exists a convex function f_ϵ and a sub-sequence $f_{\varphi^\epsilon(n)}$

such that $f_{\varphi^\epsilon(n)} \rightarrow f_\epsilon$ uniformly on K_ϵ . We will show that f_ϵ coincides with f , which means that f is in fact the limit as only possible limit for a sub-sequence. Set $\epsilon_k = \frac{\epsilon}{k}, k \geq 1$. We build by recurrence ϕ_k^ϵ in the following way. Initiate by $\phi_1^\epsilon = \varphi^\epsilon$. For $k \geq 1$, since $(f_{\phi_k^\epsilon(n)})_{n \geq 1}$ is relatively compact, we can find φ_{k+1}^ϵ such that $f_{\phi_k^\epsilon \circ \varphi_{k+1}^\epsilon(n)}$ uniformly converges to a limit f_{k+1}^ϵ on $K_{\epsilon_{k+1}}$. The f_k^ϵ satisfy the consistency property

$$\forall k \leq k', f_k^\epsilon \text{ and } f_{k'}^\epsilon \text{ coincide on } K_{\epsilon_k}.$$

Hence we set, for $z \in \cup_{k \geq 1} K_{\epsilon_k} = \text{int}(K)$, $\tilde{f}^\epsilon(z) = f_k^\epsilon(z)$, which does not depend on the k such that z is in K_{ϵ_k} due to the consistency property.

Now we set $\phi^\epsilon(k) = \phi_k^\epsilon(k)$. The sub-sequence ϕ^ϵ satisfies

$$\forall z \in \text{int}(K), f_{\phi^\epsilon(k)}(z) \rightarrow \tilde{f}^\epsilon(z).$$

Note that we also have the uniform convergence of $f_{\phi^\epsilon(k)}$ to f^ϵ on K_ϵ , and so f^ϵ and $\tilde{f}^\epsilon$ coincide on K_ϵ . By consistency we can build $\tilde{f}$ on $\text{int}(K)$ such that f_n converges point-wise to $\tilde{f}$ on $\text{int}(K)$. According to the result (6) $\Rightarrow$ (5) proved earlier, we know that $\mu_{\nabla f_n} \Rightarrow \mu_{\nabla \tilde{f}}$, and so, by unicity of the limit, $\mu_{\nabla \tilde{f}} = \mu_{\nabla f}$. Hence $\nabla \tilde{f}$ and ∇f are two monotone functions on K whose distributions coincide. The uniqueness in Brenier's theorem ensures us that they are equal a.e. We have proved that any cluster point f^ϵ of $(f_n(z), z \in K_\epsilon)$ is equal to f on K_ϵ . Hence f is the limit of f_n for the uniform convergence on K_ϵ . Since for convex functions on a convex compact set, uniform convergence and point-wise convergence are equivalent, we have

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \|f_n(z) - f(z)\|_{\infty}^{K_\epsilon} \rightarrow 0$$

which yields the result.

5.2 Proof of theorem 2.2

For the sake of clarity, we omit exponent (T) in this proof. (This concerns variables $\nabla X_n, Y_n, \mu_n, \varphi_n$).

Take h in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Hereafter, the notation Z refers to a quadruple $Z = (z^1, z^2, z^3, z^4) \in (K_d)^4$. We set $E_4 = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\mathcal{P}$ is the class of all subsets of E_4 , and for $0 \leq c \leq 4$, $\mathcal{P}_c = \{P \in \mathcal{P} \mid |P| = c\}$. We also put $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 1, \epsilon_3 = \epsilon_4 = -1$.

$$\mathbb{E}\left(|\varphi_n(h) - \mathbb{E}(\varphi_n(h))|^4\right) = \mathbb{E}\left(\left(\varphi_n(h) - \mathbb{E}(\varphi_n(h))\right)^2 \overline{\left(\varphi_n(h) - \mathbb{E}(\varphi_n(h))\right)^2}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{K_d} dz^1 \int_{K_d} dz^2 \int_{K_d} dz^3 \int_{K_d} dz^4 \prod_{q=1}^4 \left(e^{i \langle h, \epsilon_q Y_n(z^q) \rangle} - e^{-\frac{1}{2} \langle h, \text{cov}(Y_n(z^q)) h \rangle} \right) \right) \\
&= \int_{(K_d)^4} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|4-P|} e^{i \sum_{q \in P} \langle h, \epsilon_q Y_n(z^q) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q' \notin P} \langle h, \text{cov}(Y_n(z^{q'})) h \rangle} \right) dZ \\
&= \int_{(K_d)^4} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \langle h, (\text{cov}(\sum_{q \in P} \epsilon_q Y_n(z^q)) + \sum_{q' \notin P} \text{cov}(Y_n(z^{q'}))) h \rangle} dZ.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us make more precise the term $\text{cov}(\sum_{q \in P} \epsilon_q Y_n(z^q))$. Let i, j be in $\{1, \dots, d\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{cov} \left(\sum_{q \in P} \epsilon_q Y_n(z^q) \right)_{i,j} &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{q \in P} \epsilon_q Y_{n,i}(z^q) \sum_{q' \in P} \epsilon_{q'} Y_{n,j}(z^{q'}) \right) \\
&= \sum_{q, q' \in P} \epsilon_q \epsilon_{q'} \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z^q) Y_{n,j}(z^{q'})) \\
&= \sum_{q \in P} \text{cov}(Y_n(z^q))_{i,j} + \sum_{\substack{q, q' \in P \\ q \neq q'}} \epsilon_q \epsilon_{q'} \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z^q) Y_{n,j}(z^{q'})).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we define, for P in $\mathcal{P}$, Z in $(K_d)^4$, i, j in $\{1, \dots, d\}$,

$$\chi_n^P(Z)_{i,j} = \sum_{\substack{q, q' \in P \\ q \neq q'}} \epsilon_q \epsilon_{q'} \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z^q) Y_{n,j}(z^{q'})).$$

We put temporarily, for Q a finite subset of K_d , $\psi_n^Q = e^{\sum_{z \in Q} -\frac{1}{2} \langle h, \text{cov}(Y_n(z)) h \rangle}$. Notice that for two disjoint subsets Q and Q' of K_d , $\psi_n^Q \psi_n^{Q'} = \psi_n^{Q \cup Q'}$. Also, for $Z = \{z_i; 1 \leq i \leq 4\}$ in $(K_d)^4$ and $P \subset E_4$, we put $Z_P = \{z^q \mid q \in P\}$ and write for short $\psi_n^Z = \psi_n^{Z_{E_4}} = \psi_n^{\{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left(|\varphi_n(h) - \mathbb{E}(\varphi_n(h))|^4 \right) \\
&= \int_{(K_d)^4} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} \psi_n^{Z_P} \psi_n^{Z_{P^c}} e^{\sum_{i,j} h_i h_j \chi_n^P(Z)_{i,j}} dZ, \\
&= \int_{(K_d)^4} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} \psi_n^Z \left(1 + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} h_i h_j \chi_n^P(Z)_{i,j} + O(\chi_n^P(Z)^2) \right) dZ,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{(K_d)^4} \psi_n^Z \left(\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} + \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} h_i h_j \chi_n^P(Z)_{i,j} \right) dZ \\
&\quad + O \left(\int_{(K_d)^4} \psi_n^Z \chi_n^P(Z)^2 dZ \right). \quad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

Remark that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} &= \sum_{q=0}^4 \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_q} (-1)^q \\
&= 1 - 4 + 6 - 4 + 1 = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The non-negligible term is a discrete integral, that we can write in the form of a sum over the grid $\left(H_n^{(T)}\right)^4$. We put $t_n = \lambda_d \left(\frac{1}{n}T\right) = \frac{1}{n^d} \lambda_d(T)$. For any i, j in $\{1, \dots, d\}$,

$$\int_{(K_d)^4} \psi_n^Z \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} \chi_n^P(Z)_{i,j} dZ = \sum_{Z \in (H_n^T)^4} t_n^4 \psi_n^Z \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} \chi_n^P(Z)_{i,j} + c_n,$$

where $|c_n| \leq C_T/n$ a.s, according to (15). Since $\chi_n^P(Z)_{i,j}$ is a sum of terms of the form $\mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z)Y_{n,j}(\zeta))$ with $z, \zeta \in H_n^T$, the idea is to count the number of times each one of these terms appears.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{Z \in (H_n^T)^4} \psi_n^Z \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} \chi_n^P(Z)_{i,j} \\
&= \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} \sum_{\substack{q, q' \in \mathcal{P} \\ q \neq q'}} \epsilon_q \epsilon_{q'} \sum_{Z \in (H_n^T)^4} \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z^q) Y_{n,j}(z^{q'})) \psi_n^Z \\
&= \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} \sum_{\substack{q, q' \in \mathcal{P} \\ q \neq q'}} \epsilon_q \epsilon_{q'} \sum_{Z \in (H_n^T)^4} \sum_{z, \zeta \in H_n^T} \mathbf{1}_{z^q = z, z^{q'} = \zeta} \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z) Y_{n,j}(\zeta)) \psi_n^Z \\
&= \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} \sum_{\substack{q, q' \in \mathcal{P} \\ q \neq q'}} \epsilon_q \epsilon_{q'} \sum_{z, \zeta \in H_n^T} \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z) Y_{n,j}(\zeta)) \sum_{Z \in (H_n^T)^4} \mathbf{1}_{z^q = z, z^{q'} = \zeta} \psi_n^Z \\
&= \sum_{z, \zeta \in H_n^T} \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z) Y_{n,j}(\zeta)) \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|P|} \sum_{\substack{q, q' \in \mathcal{P} \\ q \neq q'}} \epsilon_q \epsilon_{q'} \sum_{z', \zeta' \in H_n^T} \psi_n^{\{z, \zeta, z', \zeta'\}} \\
&= \left(\sum_{z, \zeta \in H_n^T} \psi_n^{\{z, \zeta\}} \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z) Y_{n,j}(\zeta)) \sum_{\substack{1 \leq q, q' \leq 4 \\ q \neq q'}} \epsilon_q \epsilon_{q'} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{P} \\ P \ni q, q'}} (-1)^{|P|} \right) \times \\
&\quad \left(\sum_{z', \zeta' \in H_n^T} \psi_n^{\{z', \zeta'\}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $q \neq q' \in E_4$. Then there are exactly one P of $\mathcal{P}_2$, 2 sets P in $\mathcal{P}_3$ and 1 set of $\mathcal{P}_4$ that contain q and q' . Hence

$$\sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{P} \\ P \ni q, q'}} (-1)^{|P|} = 1 - 2 + 1 = 0$$

and the previous sum is null. The first order term of (29) reduces to the deterministic vanishing non-random term c_n .

Let us estimate the last term of (29),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{(K_d)^4} \psi_n^Z \chi_n^P(Z)^2 dZ \\
&= \int_{(K_d)^4} \sum_{P, P' \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{\substack{q, q' \in P, p, p' \in P' \\ q \neq q', p \neq p'}} \psi_n^Z \epsilon_q \epsilon_{q'} \epsilon_p \epsilon_{p'} \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z^q) Y_{n,j}(z^{q'})) \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z^p) Y_{n,j}(z^{p'})) dZ, \\
&= O \left(\int_{(K_d)^4} \psi_n^Z \sup_{i,j} |\mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z^1) Y_{n,j}(z^2))| \sup_{i,j} |\mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z^3) Y_{n,j}(z^4))| dZ \right), \\
&= O \left(\left(\int_{(K_d)^2} \psi_n^{\{z, \zeta\}} \sup_{i,j} |\mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}(z) Y_{n,j}(\zeta))| dz d\zeta \right)^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

And hence formula (17) is proved.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to warmly thank Pr.Ilya Molchanov, who suggested the use of triangulations, and more generally helped very much by many discussions to bring this article to its maturity.

References

- [1] AZAIS J. AND WSCHEBOR M., (1996) Almost sure oscillation of certain random processes, *Bernoulli* 2(3), 257-270.
- [2] BILLINGSLEY, J., (1968) Convergence of probability measures, *John Wiley & sons, New-York*.
- [3] BRENIER, Y., (1991) Polar factorization and monotone rearrangement of vector-valued functions., *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 44, 375-417.
- [4] DAVYDOV, YU. (1998) Convex rearrangements of stable processes., *J. Math. Sci.* 92, 4010-4016.
- [5] DAVYDOV, YU. AND THILLY E., (2002) Convex rearrangements of Gaussian processes., *Theory Prob. and its Applications* 47, 219-235.
- [6] DAVYDOV, YU. AND VERSHIK. A. M., (1998). Réarrangements convexes des marches aléatoires., *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré* 34, 73-95.
- [7] DAVYDOV YU. AND ZITIKIS R., (2004) Convex rearrangements of random elements., *Fields Inst. Comm.* 44, 141-171.
- [8] LACHIÈZE-REY R., (2009) Equicontinuity condition for convex functions. Consistency of convex rearrangement. *preprint*.
- [9] RYFF J. V., (1965) Orbits of L^1 functions under doubly stochastic transformations, *Trans. AMS* 117, 92-100
- [10] THILLY E., (1999) Réarrangements convexes des trajectoires de processus stochastiques., *PhD. Thesis, Université de Lille 1, France*.
- [11] VILLANI C., (2003) Topics in optimal transportation, *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, Vol. 58.
- [12] ZITIKIS R., (2002) Analysis of indices of economic inequality from a mathematical point of view. (Invited Plenary lecture at the 11th Indonesian Mathematics conference, State University of Malang, Indonesia), *Matematika* 8, 772-782.